

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
ANDERSON/GREENWOOD DIVISION

Richard M. Campbell,	)	Civil Action No. 8:10-cv-1642-RMG-JDA
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	<b><u>REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION</u></b>
	)	<b><u>OF MAGISTRATE JUDGE</u></b>
vs.	)	
	)	
Michael J. Astrue,	)	
Commissioner of Social Security,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	

This matter is before the Court for a Report and Recommendation pursuant to Local Rule 73.02(B)(2)(a), D.S.C., and Title 28, United States Code, Section 636(b)(1)(B).<sup>1</sup> Plaintiff brought this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) to obtain judicial review of a final decision of the Commissioner of Social Security (“the Commissioner”), denying Plaintiff’s claims for disability insurance benefits (“DIB”). For the reasons set forth below, it is recommended that the decision of the Commissioner be remanded pursuant to sentence six of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) for administrative action consistent with this recommendation.

**PROCEDURAL HISTORY**

Plaintiff filed a claim for DIB on June 30, 2006 [R. 9, 61–65], which was denied initially and upon reconsideration [R. 30, 32, 37–38, 43–46]. Plaintiff filed a timely request for hearing [R. 41–42], and on August 8, 2008, a hearing was held before administrative law judge (“ALJ”) Richard L. Vogel [R. 15–29].

---

<sup>1</sup>A Report and Recommendation is being filed in this case, in which one or both parties declined to consent to disposition by a magistrate judge.

The ALJ issued his decision on August 19, 2008, finding Plaintiff was not disabled for purposes of the Social Security Act (“the Act”). [R. 6–14.] The ALJ found Plaintiff had a severe impairment, degenerative disc disease of the cervical spine status-post fusion. [R. 11, Finding 3.] However, the ALJ found Plaintiff did not have an impairment or combination of impairments that meets or medically equals one of the impairments listed in 20 C.F.R. Part 404, Subpart P, Appendix 1. [R. 11, Finding 4.] Further, the ALJ found Plaintiff had the residual functional capacity to sit, stand, and walk each for six hours of an eight-hour day; frequently lift/carry ten pounds; occasionally lift 20 pounds; but Plaintiff should never be exposed to excessively cold temperatures and should never climb. [R. 11–12, Finding 5.] As a result, the ALJ determined Plaintiff was capable of performing his past relevant work as a sales associate. [R. 14, Finding 6.]

Plaintiff requested Appeals Council review of the ALJ’s decision. [R. 4–5]. On April 27, 2010, the ALJ’s findings became the final decision of the Commissioner when the Appeals Council denied Plaintiff’s request for review of the hearing decision. [R. 1–3; 20 C.F.R. § 404.981.] Plaintiff filed this action for judicial review on June 25, 2010. [Doc. 1.]

### **THE PARTIES’ POSITIONS**

Plaintiff contends the ALJ failed to properly develop the record on Plaintiff’s behalf because the ALJ considered medical records spanning only four months; Plaintiff argues the ALJ owes pro se claimants a heightened duty of care in developing the record. Plaintiff further argues for a remand pursuant to sentence six of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) because additional medical evidence is available that is material and may affect the ALJ’s decision.

The Commissioner argues the ALJ successfully fulfilled his duty to develop the record by extensively questioning Plaintiff about his education, medical treatment, and

medication, as well as questioning Plaintiff about his injury, daily routine, pain, physical limitations, and his ability to lift, sit, and work. The Commissioner further argues remand would be improper because Plaintiff has made no showing of good cause for his failure to provide the additional evidence at the administrative level. The Commissioner also contends substantial evidence supports the ALJ's assessment of Plaintiff's residual functional capacity.

### **STANDARD OF REVIEW**

The Commissioner's findings of fact are conclusive if supported by substantial evidence. 42 U.S.C. § 405(g). Substantial evidence is more than a scintilla—i.e., the evidence must do more than merely create a suspicion of the existence of a fact and must include such relevant evidence as a reasonable person would accept as adequate to support the conclusion. See *Richardson v. Perales*, 402 U.S. 389, 401 (1971) (quoting *Consolidated Edison Co. v. NLRB*, 305 U.S. 197, 229 (1938)); *Laws v. Celebrezze*, 368 F.2d 640, 642 (4th Cir. 1966) (citing *Woolridge v. Celebrezze*, 214 F. Supp. 686, 687 (S.D.W. Va. 1963)) (“Substantial evidence, it has been held, is evidence which a reasoning mind would accept as sufficient to support a particular conclusion. It consists of more than a mere scintilla of evidence but may be somewhat less than a preponderance. If there is evidence to justify a refusal to direct a verdict were the case before a jury, then there is ‘substantial evidence.’”).

Where conflicting evidence “‘allows reasonable minds to differ as to whether a claimant is disabled, the responsibility for that decision falls on the [Commissioner] (or the [Commissioner's] designate, the ALJ),” not on the reviewing court. *Craig v. Chater*, 76

F.3d 585, 589 (4th Cir. 1996) (quoting *Walker v. Bowen*, 834 F.2d 635, 640 (7th Cir. 1987)); see also *Edwards v. Sullivan*, 937 F.2d 580, 584 n.3 (11th Cir. 1991) (stating that where the Commissioner's decision is supported by substantial evidence, the court will affirm, even if the reviewer would have reached a contrary result as finder of fact and even if the reviewer finds that the evidence preponderates against the Commissioner's decision). Thus, it is not within the province of a reviewing court to determine the weight of the evidence, nor is it the court's function to substitute its judgment for that of the Commissioner so long as the decision is supported by substantial evidence. *Laws*, 368 F.2d at 642; *Snyder v. Ribicoff*, 307 F.2d 518, 520 (4th Cir. 1962).

The reviewing court will reverse a Commissioner's decision on plenary review, however, if the decision applies incorrect law or fails to provide the court with sufficient reasoning to determine that the Commissioner properly applied the law. *Myers v. Califano*, 611 F.2d 980, 982 (4th Cir. 1980); see also *Keeton v. Dep't of Health & Human Servs.*, 21 F.3d 1064, 1066 (11th Cir. 1994). Where the Commissioner's decision "is in clear disregard of the overwhelming weight of the evidence, Congress has empowered the courts to modify or reverse the [Commissioner's] decision 'with or without remanding the cause for a rehearing.'" *Vitek v. Finch*, 438 F.2d 1157, 1158 (4th Cir. 1971) (quoting 42 U.S.C. § 405(g)). Remand is unnecessary where "the record does not contain substantial evidence to support a decision denying coverage under the correct legal standard and when reopening the record for more evidence would serve no purpose." *Breeden v. Weinberger*, 493 F.2d 1002, 1012 (4th Cir. 1974).

The court may remand a case to the Commissioner for a rehearing under sentence four or sentence six of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g). *Sargent v. Sullivan*, 941 F.2d 1207 (4th Cir. 1991) (unpublished table decision). To remand under sentence four, the reviewing court must find either that the Commissioner's decision is not supported by substantial evidence or that the Commissioner incorrectly applied the law relevant to the disability claim. See, e.g., *Jackson v. Chater*, 99 F.3d 1086, 1090–91 (11th Cir. 1996) (holding remand was appropriate where the ALJ failed to develop a full and fair record of the plaintiff's residual functional capacity); *Brehem v. Harris*, 621 F.2d 688, 690 (5th Cir. 1980) (holding remand was appropriate where record was insufficient to affirm but was also insufficient for court to find the plaintiff disabled). Where the court cannot discern the basis for the Commissioner's decision, a remand under sentence four may be appropriate to allow the Commissioner to explain the basis for the decision. See *Smith v. Heckler*, 782 F.2d 1176, 1181–82 (4th Cir. 1986) (remanding case where decision of ALJ contained "a gap in its reasoning" because ALJ did not say he was discounting testimony or why); *Gordon v. Schweiker*, 725 F.2d 231, 235 (4th Cir. 1984) (remanding case where neither the ALJ nor the Appeals Council indicated the weight given to relevant evidence). On remand under sentence four, the ALJ should review the case on a complete record, including any new material evidence. See *Smith*, 782 F.2d at 1182 ("The [Commissioner] and the claimant may produce further evidence on remand."). After a remand under sentence four, the court enters a final and immediately appealable judgment and then loses jurisdiction. *Sargent*, 941 F.2d 1207 (citing *Melkonyan v. Sullivan*, 501 U.S. 89, 102 (1991)).

In contrast, sentence six provides:

The court may . . . at any time order additional evidence to be taken before the Commissioner of Social Security, but only upon a showing that there is new evidence which is material and that there is good cause for the failure to incorporate such evidence into the record in a prior proceeding . . . .

42 U.S.C. § 405(g). A reviewing court may remand a case to the Commissioner on the basis of new evidence only if four prerequisites are met: (1) the evidence is relevant to the determination of disability at the time the application was first filed; (2) the evidence is material to the extent that the Commissioner's decision might reasonably have been different had the new evidence been before him; (3) there is good cause for the claimant's failure to submit the evidence when the claim was before the Commissioner; and (4) the claimant made at least a general showing of the nature of the new evidence to the reviewing court. *Borders v. Heckler*, 777 F.2d 954, 955 (4th Cir. 1985) (citing 42 U.S.C. § 405(g); *Mitchell v. Schweiker*, 699 F.2d 185, 188 (4th Cir. 1983); *Sims v. Harris*, 631 F.2d 26, 28 (4th Cir. 1980); *King v. Califano*, 599 F.2d 597, 599 (4th Cir. 1979)), *superseded by amendment to statute*, 42 U.S.C. § 405(g), *as recognized in Wilkins v. Sec'y, Dep't of Health & Human Servs.*, 925 F.2d 769, 774 (4th Cir. 1991).<sup>2</sup> With remand under sentence six, the parties must return to the court after remand to file modified findings of fact. *Melkonyan*, 501 U.S. at 98. The reviewing court retains jurisdiction pending remand and does not enter a final judgment until after the completion of remand proceedings. See

---

<sup>2</sup>Though the court in *Wilkins* indicated in a parenthetical that the four-part test set forth in *Borders* had been superseded by an amendment to 42 U.S.C. § 405(g), courts in the Fourth Circuit have continued to cite the requirements outlined in *Borders* when evaluating a claim for remand based on new evidence. See, e.g., *Ashton v. Astrue*, No. 6:10-cv-152, 2010 WL 5478646, at \*8 (D.S.C. Nov. 23, 2010); *Washington v. Comm'r of Soc. Sec.*, No. 2:08-cv-93, 2009 WL 86737, at \*5 (E.D. Va. Jan. 13, 2009); *Brock v. Sec'y of Health & Human Servs.*, 807 F. Supp. 1248, 1250 n.3 (S.D.W. Va. 1992). Further, the Supreme Court of the United States has not suggested *Borders*' construction of § 405(g) is incorrect. See *Sullivan v. Finkelstein*, 496 U.S. 617, 626 n.6 (1990). Accordingly, the Court will apply the more stringent *Borders* inquiry.

*Allen v. Chater*, 67 F.3d 293 (4th Cir. 1995) (unpublished table decision) (holding that an order remanding a claim for Social Security benefits pursuant to sentence six of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) is not a final order).

### **APPLICABLE LAW**

The Act provides that disability benefits shall be available to those persons insured for benefits, who are not of retirement age, who properly apply, and who are under a disability. 42 U.S.C. § 423(a). “Disability” is defined as:

the inability to engage in any substantial gainful activity by reason of any medically determinable physical or mental impairment which can be expected to result in death or which has lasted or can be expected to last for a continuous period of not less than 12 consecutive months.

*Id.* § 423(d)(1)(A).

#### **I. The Five Step Evaluation**

To facilitate uniform and efficient processing of disability claims, federal regulations have reduced the statutory definition of disability to a series of five sequential questions. *See, e.g., Heckler v. Campbell*, 461 U.S. 458, 461 n.2 (1983) (noting a “need for efficiency” in considering disability claims). The ALJ must consider whether (1) the claimant is engaged in substantial gainful activity; (2) the claimant has a severe impairment; (3) the impairment meets or equals an impairment included in the Administration’s Official Listings of Impairments found at 20 C.F.R. Part 404, Subpart P, Appendix 1; (4) the impairment prevents the claimant from performing past relevant work; and (5) the impairment prevents the claimant from having substantial gainful employment. 20 C.F.R. § 404.1520. Through the fourth step, the burden of production and proof is on the claimant. *Grant v. Schweiker*,

699 F.2d 189, 191 (4th Cir. 1983). The claimant must prove disability on or before the last day of her insured status to receive disability benefits. *Everett v. Sec’y of Health, Educ. & Welfare*, 412 F.2d 842, 843 (4th Cir. 1969). If the inquiry reaches step five, the burden shifts to the Commissioner to produce evidence that other jobs exist in the national economy that the claimant can perform, considering the claimant’s age, education, and work experience. *Id.* If at any step of the evaluation the ALJ can find an individual is disabled or not disabled, further inquiry is unnecessary. 20 C.F.R. § 404.1520(a); *Hall v. Harris*, 658 F.2d 260, 264 (4th Cir. 1981).

**A. Substantial Gainful Activity**

“Substantial gainful activity” must be both substantial—involves doing significant physical or mental activities, 20 C.F.R. § 404.1572(a)—and gainful—done for pay or profit, whether or not a profit is realized, 20 C.F.R. § 404.1572(b). If an individual has earnings from employment or self-employment above a specific level set out in the regulations, he is generally presumed to be able to engage in substantial gainful activity. 20 C.F.R. § 404.1574–.1575.

**B. Severe Impairment**

An impairment is “severe” if it significantly limits an individual’s ability to perform basic work activities. See 20 C.F.R. § 404.1521. When determining whether a claimant’s physical and mental impairments are sufficiently severe, the ALJ must consider the combined effect of all of the claimant’s impairments. 42 U.S.C. § 423(d)(2)(B). The ALJ must evaluate a disability claimant as a whole person and not in the abstract, having



several hypothetical and isolated illnesses. *Walker v. Bowen*, 889 F.2d 47, 49–50 (4th Cir. 1989) (stating that, when evaluating the effect of a number of impairments on a disability claimant, “the [Commissioner] must consider the combined effect of a claimant’s impairments and not fragmentize them”). Accordingly, the ALJ must make specific and well-articulated findings as to the effect of a combination of impairments when determining whether an individual is disabled. *Id.* at 50 (“As a corollary to this rule, the ALJ must adequately explain his or her evaluation of the combined effects of the impairments.”). If the ALJ finds a combination of impairments to be severe, “the combined impact of the impairments shall be considered throughout the disability determination process.” 42 U.S.C. § 423(d)(2)(B).

**C. *Meets or Equals an Impairment Listed in the Listings of Impairments***

If a claimant’s impairment or combination of impairments meets or medically equals the criteria of a listing found at 20 C.F.R. Part 404, Subpart P, Appendix 1 and meets the duration requirement found at 20 C.F.R. § 404.1509, the ALJ will find the claimant disabled without considering the claimant’s age, education, and work experience. 20 C.F.R. § 404.1520(d).

**D. *Past Relevant Work***

The assessment of a claimant’s ability to perform past relevant work “reflect[s] the statute’s focus on the functional capacity retained by the claimant.” *Pass v. Chater*, 65 F.3d 1200, 1204 (4th Cir. 1995). At this step of the evaluation, the ALJ compares the

claimant's residual functional capacity<sup>3</sup> with the physical and mental demands of the kind of work he has done in the past to determine whether the claimant has the residual functional capacity to do his past work. 20 C.F.R. § 404.1560(b).

#### **E. Other Work**

As previously stated, once the ALJ finds that a claimant cannot return to her prior work, the burden of proof shifts to the Commissioner to establish that the claimant could perform other work that exists in the national economy. See 20 C.F.R. § 404.1520(f)–(g); *Hunter v. Sullivan*, 993 F.2d 31, 35 (4th Cir. 1992). To meet this burden, the Commissioner may sometimes rely exclusively on the Medical-Vocational Guidelines (the “grids”). Exclusive reliance on the “grids” is appropriate where the claimant suffers primarily from an exertional impairment, without significant nonexertional factors.<sup>4</sup> 20 C.F.R. Pt. 404, Subpt. P, App. 2, § 200.00(e); *Gory v. Schweiker*, 712 F.2d 929, 930–31 (4th Cir. 1983) (stating that exclusive reliance on the grids is appropriate in cases involving exertional limitations). When a claimant suffers from both exertional and nonexertional limitations, the grids may serve only as guidelines. *Gory*, 712 F.2d at 931. In such a case, the Commissioner must use a vocational expert to establish the claimant's ability to perform other work. 20 C.F.R. § 404.1569a; see *Walker*, 889 F.2d at 49–50 (“Because we

---

<sup>3</sup>Residual functional capacity is “the most [a claimant] can do despite [his] limitations.” 20 C.F.R. § 404.1545(e)

<sup>4</sup>An exertional limitation is one that affects the claimant's ability to meet the strength requirements of jobs. 20 C.F.R. § 404.1569a. A nonexertional limitation is one that affects the ability to meet the demands of the job other than the strength demands. *Id.* Examples of nonexertional limitations include but are not limited to difficulty functioning because of being nervous, anxious, or depressed; difficulty maintaining attention or concentrating; difficulty understanding or remembering detailed instructions; difficulty seeing or hearing. *Id.*

have found that the grids cannot be relied upon to show conclusively that claimant is not disabled, when the case is remanded it will be incumbent upon the [Commissioner] to prove by expert vocational testimony that despite the combination of exertional and nonexertional impairments, the claimant retains the ability to perform specific jobs which exist in the national economy.”). The purpose of using a vocational expert is “to assist the ALJ in determining whether there is work available in the national economy which this particular claimant can perform.” *Walker*, 889 F.2d at 50. For the vocational expert’s testimony to be relevant, “it must be based upon a consideration of all other evidence in the record, . . . and it must be in response to proper hypothetical questions which fairly set out all of claimant’s impairments.” *Id.* (citations omitted).

## **II. Developing the Record**

The ALJ has a duty to fully and fairly develop the record. *See Cook v. Heckler*, 783 F.2d 1168, 1173 (4th Cir. 1986). The ALJ is required to inquire fully into each relevant issue. *Snyder*, 307 F.2d at 520. The performance of this duty is particularly important when a claimant appears without counsel. *Marsh v. Harris*, 632 F.2d 296, 299 (4th Cir. 1980). In such circumstances, “the ALJ should scrupulously and conscientiously probe into, inquire of, and explore for all the relevant facts, . . . being especially diligent in ensuring that favorable as well as unfavorable facts and circumstances are elicited.” *Id.* (internal quotations and citations omitted).

### III. Treating Physicians

The opinion of a claimant's treating physician must "be given great weight and may be disregarded only if there is persuasive contradictory evidence" in the record. *Coffman v. Bowen*, 829 F.2d 514, 517 (4th Cir. 1987) (citing *Foster v. Heckler*, 780 F.2d 1125, 1130 (4th Cir. 1986) (holding that a treating physician's testimony is entitled to great weight because it reflects an expert judgment based on a continuing observation of the patient's condition over a prolonged period of time); *Mitchell v. Schweiker*, 699 F.2d 185, 187 (4th Cir. 1983)). If a treating physician's opinion on the nature and severity of a claimant's impairments is "well-supported by medically acceptable clinical and laboratory diagnostic techniques and is not inconsistent with the other substantial evidence" in the record, the ALJ must give it controlling weight. 20 C.F.R. § 404.1527(d)(2); see *Mastro v. Apfel*, 270 F.3d 171, 178 (4th Cir. 2001). The ALJ may discount a treating physician's opinion if it is unsupported or inconsistent with other evidence. *Craig*, 76 F.3d at 590. Similarly, where a treating physician has merely made conclusory statements, the ALJ may afford the opinion such weight as is supported by clinical or laboratory findings and other consistent evidence of a claimant's impairments. See *id.* (holding there was sufficient evidence for the ALJ to reject the treating physician's conclusory opinion where the record contained contradictory evidence).

When a treating physician's opinion does not warrant controlling weight, the ALJ must nevertheless assign a weight to the medical opinion based on the 1) length of the treatment relationship and the frequency of examination; 2) nature and extent of the

treatment relationship; 3) supportability of the opinion; 4) consistency of the opinion with the record as a whole; 5) specialization of the physician; and 6) other factors which tend to support or contradict the opinion. 20 C.F.R. § 404.1527(d). In any instance, a treating physician's opinion is generally entitled to more weight than a consulting physician's opinion. See *Mitchell*, 699 F.2d at 187 (stating that treating physician's opinion must be accorded great weight because "it reflects an expert judgment based on a continuing observation of the patient's condition for a prolonged period of time"); 20 C.F.R. § 404.1527(d)(2). An ALJ determination coming down on the side of a non-examining, non-treating physician's opinion can stand only if the medical testimony of examining and treating physicians goes both ways. *Smith v. Schweiker*, 795 F.2d 343, 346 (4th Cir.1986).

The ALJ is required to review all of the medical findings and other evidence that support a medical source's statement that a claimant is disabled. 20 C.F.R. § 404.1527(e). However, the ALJ is responsible for making the ultimate determination about whether a claimant meets the statutory definition of disability. *Id.*

#### **IV. Medical Tests and Examinations**

The ALJ is required to order additional medical tests and exams only when a claimant's medical sources do not give sufficient medical evidence about an impairment to determine whether the claimant is disabled. 20 C.F.R. § 404.1517; see also *Conley v. Bowen*, 781 F.2d 143, 146 (8th Cir. 1986). The regulations are clear: a consultative examination is not required when there is sufficient medical evidence to make a determination on a claimant's disability. 20 C.F.R. § 404.1517. Under the regulations,

however, the ALJ may determine that a consultative examination or other medical tests are necessary. *Id.*

## **V. Pain**

Congress has determined that a claimant will not be considered disabled unless he furnishes medical and other evidence (e.g., medical signs and laboratory findings) showing the existence of a medical impairment that could reasonably be expected to produce the pain or symptoms alleged. 42 U.S.C. § 423(d)(5)(A). In evaluating claims of disabling pain, the ALJ must proceed in a two-part analysis. *Morgan v. Barnhart*, 142 F. App'x 716, 723 (4th Cir. 2005) (unpublished opinion). First, “the ALJ must determine whether the claimant has produced medical evidence of a ‘medically determinable impairment which could reasonably be expected to produce . . . the actual pain, in the amount and degree, alleged by the claimant.’” *Id.* (quoting *Craig*, 76 F.3d at 594). Second, “if, and only if, the ALJ finds that the claimant has produced such evidence, the ALJ must then determine, as a matter of fact, whether the claimant’s underlying impairment *actually* causes her alleged pain.” *Id.* (emphasis in original) (citing *Craig*, 76 F.3d at 595).

Under the Fourth Circuit’s “pain rule,” it is well established that “subjective complaints of pain and physical discomfort can give rise to a finding of total disability, even when those complaints [a]re not supported fully by objective observable signs.” *Coffman*, 829 F.2d at 518. The ALJ must consider all of a claimant’s statements about his symptoms, including pain, and determine the extent to which the symptoms can reasonably be accepted as consistent with the objective medical evidence. 20 C.F.R. § 404.1528.

Indeed, the Fourth Circuit has rejected a rule which would require the claimant to demonstrate objective evidence of the pain itself, *Jenkins v. Sullivan*, 906 F.2d 107, 108 (4th Cir. 1990), and ordered the Commissioner to promulgate and distribute to all administrative law judges within the circuit a policy stating Fourth Circuit law on the subject of pain as a disabling condition, *Hyatt v. Sullivan*, 899 F.2d 329, 336–37 (4th Cir. 1990). The Commissioner thereafter issued the following “Policy Interpretation Ruling”:

This Ruling supersedes, only in states within the Fourth Circuit (North Carolina, South Carolina, Maryland, Virginia and West Virginia), Social Security Ruling (SSR) 88-13, Titles II and XVI: Evaluation of Pain and Other Symptoms:

...

**FOURTH CIRCUIT STANDARD:** Once an underlying physical or [m]ental impairment that could reasonably be expected to cause pain is shown by medically acceptable objective evidence, such as clinical or laboratory diagnostic techniques, the adjudicator must evaluate the disabling effects of a disability claimant’s pain, even though its intensity or severity is shown only by subjective evidence. If an underlying impairment capable of causing pain is shown, subjective evidence of the pain, its intensity or degree can, by itself, support a finding of disability. Objective medical evidence of pain, its intensity or degree (i.e., manifestations of the functional effects of pain such as deteriorating nerve or muscle tissue, muscle spasm, or sensory or motor disruption), if available, should be obtained and considered. Because pain is not readily susceptible of objective proof, however, the absence of objective medical evidence of the intensity, severity, degree or functional effect of pain is not determinative.

SSR 90-1p, 55 Fed. Reg. 31, 898-02 (Aug. 6, 1990), *superseded by* SSR 96-7p, 61 Fed. Reg. 34,483-01 (July 2, 1996) (“If an individual’s statements about pain or other symptoms are not substantiated by the objective medical evidence, the adjudicator must consider all

of the evidence in the case record, including any statements by the individual and other persons concerning the individual's symptoms."); see 20 C.F.R. § 404.1529(c)(1)–(c)(2).

## **VI. Credibility**

The ALJ must make a credibility determination based upon all the evidence in the record. Where an ALJ decides not to credit a claimant's testimony about pain, the ALJ must articulate specific and adequate reasons for doing so, or the record must be obvious as to the credibility finding. *Hammond v. Heckler*, 765 F.2d 424, 426 (4th Cir. 1985). Although credibility determinations are generally left to the ALJ's discretion, such determinations should not be sustained if they are based on improper criteria. *Breeden*, 493 F.2d at 1010 ("We recognize that the administrative law judge has the unique advantage of having heard the testimony firsthand, and ordinarily we may not disturb credibility findings that are based on a witness's demeanor. But administrative findings based on oral testimony are not sacrosanct, and if it appears that credibility determinations are based on improper or irrational criteria they cannot be sustained.").

## **APPLICATION AND ANALYSIS**

Plaintiff urges the Court to remand pursuant to sentence six of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) because Plaintiff has new evidence that he contends would impact the ALJ's determination and would establish disability before Plaintiff's last insured date. Plaintiff argues he meets the good cause requirement of sentence six because, as a pro se claimant, he was not



aware of the opportunity to submit the additional evidence to the Appeals Council. The Court agrees.<sup>5</sup>

As stated above, a court may remand a case based on new evidence only if four prerequisites are met: (1) the evidence is relevant to the determination of disability at the time the application was first filed; (2) the evidence is material to the extent that the Commissioner's decision might reasonably have been different had the new evidence been before him; (3) there is good cause for the claimant's failure to submit the evidence when the claim was before the Commissioner; and (4) the claimant made at least a general showing of the nature of the new evidence to the reviewing court. *Borders*, 777 F.2d at 955 (citation omitted). Further, a court may have good cause to remand "where the absence of counsel appears to prejudice a claimant." *Walker v. Harris*, 642 F.2d 712, 714 (4th Cir. 1981).

Plaintiff's additional evidence includes emergency room exam notes from visits for back and neck pain in 2003, an injured finger in 2008, and back pain in 2008; imaging conducted in 2009 that revealed multiple benign lesions on the liver; physical therapy notes from late 2008, relating to therapy for Plaintiff's neck and back pain; MRIs of the lumbar

---

<sup>5</sup> Because the Court recommends remanding this case pursuant to sentence six of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g), the Court need not address Plaintiff's argument that the ALJ failed to fully develop the record in the proceedings below. If the District Court adopts the Court's recommendation to remand the case pursuant to sentence six, the Court directs the Administration to ensure the record is fully developed in subsequent proceedings. See *Craig*, 76 F.3d at 591 (holding the ALJ discharged heightened duty to develop the record in a pro se case where the ALJ thoroughly reviewed the claimant's medical records and questioned the claimant and the claimant's witnesses about all relevant matters, including the claimant's education level, ability to read and write, living conditions, former work, daily activities, and subjective complaints of pain); *Sims*, 631 F.2d at 28 (holding claimant suffered clear prejudice and unfairness as a result of her lack of counsel where the claimant had difficulty establishing for the record her name, age, and address; the claimant was confused about how to object to medical evidence in her file; the claimant's testimony about her medical problems was directionless and incoherent; the ALJ was unfamiliar with and failed to establish the claimant's former job duties and medical problems; and the ALJ's comments indicated a disinclination to help the claimant fully develop her case).

spine and cervical spine from 2008; and notes relating to possible sleep apnea. [Docs. 19-1, 19-2.] The Court finds that the additional evidence relating to neck pain—physical therapy Plaintiff underwent in 2008, after the date of the ALJ's decision—meets the first requirement of *Borders* because the evidence is relevant to Plaintiff's disability at the time he filed his application in 2006; this evidence suggests Plaintiff suffered from a continuous neck impairment since the alleged onset date, *see Mitchell*, 699 F.2d at 189. Further, the Court finds the additional evidence relating to neck pain is material because it appears to contradict the ALJ's finding that Plaintiff had failed to put forth evidence of treatment for his allegedly disabling pain outside of his visits to Dr. Pacult. Thus, there is a reasonable possibility that the ALJ's decision may have been different if he had additional objective evidence relating to Plaintiff's neck pain. *See Meadows v. Sullivan*, 930 F.2d 913, 1991 WL 58447, at \*3 (4th Cir. 1991) (unpublished table decision). Moreover, Plaintiff has submitted the additional evidence to the Court, satisfying the fourth requirement of *Borders*.

The Court also finds Plaintiff has demonstrated good cause for his failure to submit the additional evidence of his neck pain during the administrative proceedings. First, the additional evidence could not have been before the ALJ because Plaintiff underwent the physical therapy in October and November 2008 [Doc. 19-1 at 5–9, 16–24], which was after the ALJ's August 2008 decision. Second, the letter accompanying the ALJ's decision informed Plaintiff that he should submit any new evidence he wanted the Appeals Council to review *with* his request for Appeals Council review. [R. 6 (emphasis in original).] Plaintiff submitted his request for review within a week of the ALJ's decision [see R. 4–5],

which was also before he participated in physical therapy for his neck and back pain.<sup>6</sup> Finally, the Court finds remand under sentence six would avoid any prejudice to Plaintiff resulting from his lack of counsel in the administrative proceedings.<sup>7</sup> Therefore, the Court finds that a remand pursuant to sentence six of § 405(g) is appropriate.

### **CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION**

Wherefore, based on the foregoing, it is recommended that the decision of the Commissioner be REVERSED and REMANDED pursuant to sentence six of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) for administrative action consistent with this recommendation.

IT IS SO RECOMMENDED.

s/Jacquelyn D. Austin  
United States Magistrate Judge

June 10, 2011  
Greenville, South Carolina

---

<sup>6</sup> The Court notes that the Appeals Council issued notice of its denial of Plaintiff's request for review on April 27, 2010, more than one year after Plaintiff acquired the additional evidence relating to his neck impairment. [R. 1–3.] However, the Fourth Circuit has found that good cause existed for not presenting additional evidence earlier when the additional evidence did not exist before the Appeals Council denied review. *Borders*, 777 F.2d at 955. Therefore, whether the additional evidence was available for Appeals Council review appears to be irrelevant, as long as the *Borders* requirements are met for a court to remand pursuant to sentence six of § 405(g).

<sup>7</sup> In *Sims*, the Fourth Circuit held remand was proper because the claimant's "lack of representation by counsel coupled with the Administrative Law Judge's failure to help her adequately develop the evidence led to a denial to claimant of a full and fair hearing." 631 F.2d 28. The court stated, "[I]t is settled that where the absence of counsel created clear prejudice or unfairness to the claimant, a remand is proper." *Id.* (citing *Dombrowsky v. Califano*, 606 F.2d 403 (3d Cir. 1979)). Because the absence of counsel likely prevented Plaintiff from fully developing the record by omitting the additional evidence, the Court finds remanding the case pursuant to sentence six would avoid any prejudice resulting from Plaintiff's lack of counsel.